3/1

A FEW PLAIN REASONS WHY A PROTESTANT OF THE CHURCH of ENGLAND, Should not Turn Roman Catholick.

By a real Catholick of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

Thomas Barlow

(Thos. (Barlow.)

1 Thess. 5. 21. *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.*

IMPRIMATUR.

Jo. Battely.

Septemb. 15. 1687.

LONDON,

Printed for *R. Clavel*, at the *Peacock* at the West End of St. *Paul's*. MDCLXXXVIII.

(1688)

UMI

My Reverend Friend,

I Received Yours, wherein you tell me, That ſome Emiſſaries have of late earneſtly ſolicited ſome of your Pariſh, (and ſo belonging to your Cure and Charge) to deſert the Church of *England*, and turn (as they would be call'd) *Roman* Catholicks.

The Motives (amongſt ſome others) they principally inſiſt upon, (you ſay) are theſe Two: *Firſt*, That if they return to their Mother Church of *Rome*, they will have (what they ſay, Proteſtants neither have, nor pretend to) *a ſure and Infallible Guide* to ſecure them from all Error and Hereſies; which will be a great Bleſſing and comfort to them.

Secondly, They will free themſelves from the great and mortal ſin of Schiſm: For the Proteſtants (they ſay) neither have, nor can have any juſt reaſon to deſert the Catholick Church of *Rome*; and ſo their Separation from it, is evidently Schiſmatical.

You deſire me, to give You ſome directions, how to Reply to theſe Pretences, and fortifie your People againſt them, who are not skilled in ſuch Controverſies. You ſhould rather have apply'd your ſelf to your Dioceſan; for his Abilities, and immediate concern to aſſiſt you, being more than mine, I doubt not, but he would willingly have aſſiſted you.

But ſeeing you ſay, you are not particularly known to him, and therefore not willing (by any ſuch Addreſs) to trouble him; and ſeeing we are bound to give a * *reaſon* of the hope and faith which is in us, * 1 Pet. 3. 15, 16.

for the Confirmation of ſome, and Conviction of others; I ſhall (in obedience to your Command) crave leave to ſay a few things, and leave the management of them to your Prudence, according to the ſeveral Circumſtances of Perſons, Times, and Places wherein You may have occaſion to make uſe of any of them. And here,

1. In the general, I ſhou'd adviſe; That when you have occaſion to diſcourſe of any of theſe Points, with the Romiſh Prieſts and Emiſſaries, who endeavour to ſeduce any of your Pariſhioners; you remember and obſerve that good Rule in the * Goſpel--*If any man be overtaken in a fault*, You *who are ſpiritual reſtore him* (ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε) *in the ſpirit of meekneſs*. All railing, all bitter and provoking language ſhould be avoided; and then by your good Reaſons, and a Chriſtian and Meek urging of them, you may poſſibly bring your Adverſary to ſee the Errors of his own Church, which he endeavours to propagate in Ours.

* *Gal.* 6. 1. 1 *Pet.* 3. 15.

2. For the Infallibility of *their* ‖ *Church* (of which they continually, and (without any thing like a good reaſon) ſo vainly boaſt of.) I conſider,

‖ *That the Church of Rome was infallible, no man before* Gregory *the* 7*th. ever ſaid. He tells us indeed, in his* Dictatus Papæ. *Num.* 22. --Quod Romana Eccleſia nunquam erravit, nec (Scriptura Teſte) in perpetuum errabit. *Vide* Edmundi Richerii *Hiſtoriam Concil. Generalium cap.*13. *pag.*197. *Edit. Colon.* 1680.

1. That if it did (which neither does, nor ever can) really appear, that they had an Infallible Guide, we of the Church of *England* are not ſo irrational as not to follow an Infallible Guide; nor ſo ſimple, to take an *ignis fatuus*, for a real and true fire, and believe they have ſuch a Guide, becauſe (againſt evident reaſon) they confidently ſay ſo.

2. They

2. They are not yet agreed amongſt themſelves, who is their Infallible Guide: And can they think it poſſible for them to perſwade us, that they have an Infallible Guide, when they themſelves know not who it is? For,

1. Many of them place this Infallibility in the Pope, ſo *Gratian* (and the Canoniſts who follow him) who tells us: That (*a*) *all the Pope's Sanctions are to be taken as if they had been confirmed by the divine mouth of S.* Peter. And the (*b*) *Gloſs*, and (*c*) *Marginal note*, in another place, tells us, That *to diſpute or doubt of the goodneſs of any of the Pope's actions is a mortal ſin, and ſacrilege.* So we have it in the *beſt* (*d*) *Edition* of their Canon-Law with the Gloſſes. So Pope *Leo* 10. in his Bull againſt *Luther*, tells us, That *neither the Roman* (*e*) *Church*, nor any of the (*f*) Popes ever err'd in any of their Conſtitutions. And to this purpoſe, the Jeſuits make the Popes as *Peter's* Succeſſors, Infallible; *not only in matters of Faith, but of Fact too:* as appears by their famous (*g*) *Theſes* publickly defended in *France*.

(*a*) Sic omnes Apoſtolicæ ſedis Sanctiones accipiendæ ſunt, tanquàm ipſius divini *Petri* voce firmatæ. *Can. Sic omnes* 2 *Diſt.* 19.

(*b*) *Gloſſa. Quæ enim. Diſt.* 40. *cap.* 1.

(*c*) *lib.* 5. *pag.* 213. *Ed. Par.* 1612.

(*d*) *Par.* 1612. *Greg.* 13. *juſſu editum, & ad exemplar Romanum diligentèr recognitum.*

(*e*) *Vid. Conc. per. P.* 1. *Crab Tom.* 3. *p.* 717. *col.* 1. (*f*) *Ib. p.* 718. *col.* 1.

(*g*) *See the Jeſuits printed Theſes defended in their College of* Clermont, *Decem.* 12. 1661. *Theſ.* 19, 20.

2. Many place the Infallibility in the Pope and Church, or General Council concurring: So the Clergy (*h*) of *France*.

(*b*) *See the Declaration of the French Clergy, Mar.* 23. 1661. *Art.* 4.

3. Others in a *General Council* without the Pope: So the Council of *Piſa* and *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, in which ſeveral Popes are condemn'd as Hereticks, Schiſmaticks, *&c.* and the ſupream Power to be in the (*i*) Council, and that Infallible.

(*i*) *Vid. Concil. Baſil. apud Per. Crab. Tom.* 3. *p.* 146. *col.* 1. & 148. *col.* 1.

Now is it not unreaſonable for them to boaſt of an Infallible Judge of Controverſies, and think to per-

ſwade us to believe it; when they themſelves know not who that Judge is. If *Sempronius* were very ſick, and *Caius* coming to him, and pitying his condition, ſhould tell him, that there was an excellent Phyſician in that City, but knew not who he was, nor where to find him: *Sempronius* would have little comfort or benefit from ſuch a ſtory. No more can we from them, who tell us (with great confidence, but without any juſt proof or probability) that they have an Infallible Guide in their Church, but can neither tell us who it is, or where to find him.

But to manifeſt the exceeding vanity of their pretence to an Infallible Guide; there are certain, and (to all Impartial Judges) evident reaſons to demonſtrate, That neither the Pope, nor Council, nor both together are Infallible.

1. The Pope not Infallible.
Vid. Nic. Lyranum in Matth. 16. & Jo. Launoium Epiſt. part. 8. Ep. 13. pag. 387. & alibi paſſim.

1. For the Pope, they ſay, that he is Infallible as S. *Peter*'s Succeſſor, and (as *Peter* was) Vicar of Chriſt. But this is *gratis dictum*, without any juſt proof or probability. For,

1. Admit S. *Peter* was 25 years (as they ſay) Biſhop of *Rome*; (which is evidently untrue) yet that he left Infallibility to his Succeſſor there, is an Aſſertion which has no ground in Scripture, or Antiquity; the Popes themſelves not ſo much as pretending to Infallibility, for a thouſand years after our Bleſſed Saviour.

2. S. *Paul* was an Apoſtle, and as Infallible as *Peter*, and planted many Churches in *Aſia*, *Macedonia*, and *Achaia*, *&c.* and left his Succeſſors there: But it is confeſs'd, that S. *Paul* did not leave his Infallibility to any of his Succeſſors, (not to *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, nor *Titus* in *Crete*) and therefore, that

that *Peter* ſhould (which S. *Paul* did not) leave his Infallibility to his Succeſſor, is a Poſition for which they neither bring, nor can bring any juſt proof.

3. They ſay, that *Peter* was (before he came to *Rome*) Biſhop of *Antioch* 7 years; and 'tis certain and confeſs'd, that his Succeſſors at *Antioch*, (tho' that was his firſt Biſhoprick) had no ſuch Infallibility left them by *Peter*; and therefore I deſire to know, how his Succeſſors at *Rome* (his ſecond Biſhoprick) come to have the privilege of Infallibility, which his Succeſſors at *Antioch* (his firſt Biſhoprick) had not? moſt certain it is, that Infallibility is a perſonal privilege, depending ſolely and wholely on the free grace and gift of God; nor had ever any Prophet or Apoſtle power to transfer it to their Succeſſors, or any body elſe; and therefore unleſs they can make it appear from Scripture, or ſome Divine Revelation (which is impoſſible) that God has granted and given Infallibility to the Pope, as *Peter*'s Succeſſor and Chriſt's Vicar, their pretence to it, will be (what indeed it is) very irrational.

4. And this Poſition (that the Pope is not Infallible) does farther appear (to ſay nothing of particular Writers) by the clear and undeniable Teſtimonies of National and General Councils.

1. The Church of *France* in a * *late* and National Aſſembly of her Clergy, expreſly denyes the Popes Infallibility, as much as we Proteſtants, whom they are pleaſed commonly to miſcal Hereticks.

* In the Declaration of the French Clergy Mar. 23. 1682. before cited.

2. Their General Council of *Baſil* tells us; That ‖ *ſeveral Popes* have fall'n into Errors and Hereſies.

‖ *Nonnulli ſummi Pontifices in Hæreſes & Errores lapſi leguntur. P. Crab. Concil. Tom.* 3. *p.* 146. *col.* 1.

And

And again, it *often* * *happens, and may happen* (as that Council says) *That the Pope may err.*

* *Sæpe contingit, & contingere potest, Papam errare.* Ib. p. 148. col. 1.

3. Their General Council of *Constance*, (amongst other crimes) declares Pope *Benedict* 13. a ‖ *Notorious Schismatick*, incorrigible, and a pertinacious Heretick.

‖ *Notorium Schismaticum, incorrigibilem & pertinacem Hæreticum, à fide devium,* Concil. Constanc. Sess. 14.

4. To omit Pope *Vigilius* condemn'd for Heresie in the Fifth General Council, (which is by * Dr. *Crakanthorp* fully and evidently proved) I shall only add (which is undeniable and authentick Authority against the Popes Infallibility) That the Sixth General Council, (held at *Constantinople* in *Trullo*) did condem and ‖ Anathematize Pope *Honorius*. And tho' some Zealots for *Rome* and the Popes Infallibility, (such as *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*) have endeavoured to excuse *Honorius*, and question the Authority of the Council, and the Truth of those things, which in the Council were urged against him: yet the evidence on which they condemned *Honorius* for an Heretick, was undoubtedly good, even his own Epistles read in the Council (which *Bellarmine* pretends were fictitious) But both the Authority of the Council, and of *Honorius* his Epistles, (which were the Evidence on which they condemn'd him) are so fully and evidently justified (to omit many others) by a * Learned *Sorbon* Doctor, and a *Roman* Catholick, that I neither need, nor shall say any more of this particular, but refer the Reader (who desires more satisfaction) to that Judicious and learned Author.

* In his Book *de Vigilio Dormitante.*

‖ *Synodus 6. in Trullo, Act. 4. & Act.* 13. the words in the Council are, *Anathema Honorio,* &c. He being a Monothelite, and for that Heresie condemn'd.

* *Vid. Ed. Riberium in Historia Concil. Generalium, cap.* 10. *per totum: præcipue Num* 15, &c. & *Num.* 25. *Ubi objectionibus Bellarmini & Baronii respondet.*

I ſhall only add (in ſhort) two things, which to me ſeem very material.

1. That notwithſtanding, that Sixth General Council condemned *Honorius* for an Heretick, yet it was approv'd and receiv'd as a General Council by Pope *Leo* the ſecond, (the next Succeſſor (ſave one) to *Honorius*) as evidently appears by his own Epiſtle * to the Emperors, and ‖ *their own* Roman Breviary, of their moſt * correct Edition. And to make it more evident that the Sixth Synod, and the condemnation of Pope *Honorius* for Hereſie, was anciently approv'd even in the Church of *Rome*; their own General Council, the Second of *Nice*, is a witneſs beyond exception, as by the words and place in the Margin ‖ may evidently appear.

* *Extat apud Fourvium Conc. part. 1. p. 84 col. 4. in fine Synodi 6. In editione Conciliorum Romana & Suriana.*

‖ *In feſto Leonis Papæ Junii 28. Lection. 3. Sanctus Leo probavit Acta 6. Synodi: Ergo damnationem Honorii hæretici.* * *Brev. Rom. ex Decreto Concilii Trident. reſtitutum, à Pio 5. editum, à Clemente 8. & Urbano 8 recognitum,* Antwerp. 1660. ‖ *Prædicamus quemadmodum ſexta Synodus definivit, deteſtamurque cum ea, Sergium, Honorium, &c. impios iſtos Pietatis impugnatores Anathematizamus, Synodum* Nicena 2. *apud Fourvium de Concilio part. 1. pag. 106.*

2. But that which may ſeem ſtrange, (tho' it be moſt true) by the Decree of the Council of *Conſtance*, every Pope at his Conſecration, was to take a *ſolemn Oath to believe and maintain* (amongſt other Councils) *the* * *6. Synod* (of which we are now ſpeaking) *and every part and particle of it*; and conſequently they were bound to approve that Synod, and their Condemnation of Pope *Honorius*, as an Heretick. For this condemnation of *Honorius* it was evidently an Act of the 6 Synod; and the Popes (by the ſaid Decree of the Council of *Conſtance*) were bound (amongſt other Councils mentioned in the Decree) to believe and profeſs the Acts of that ſixth Synod, *Uſque ad unum Apicem*, for ſo the Decree expreſly ſays.

* *Conc. Conſt. in forma profeſſionis fidei à Papa facienda, ſeſſ. 39.* Ego *N.* juro me credere & tenere fidem cath. Sanctorum 8. Conc. Niceni, Conſtant. *&c.* quinti & ſexti, *&c.* & illam fidem uſque ad unum apicem immutilatam ſervare. *Decretum hoc, de Profeſſione fidei à Papa facienda conditum eſt Anno* 1417.

The

The Premiſſes conſider'd, I believe it may, and will appear to all intelligent and impartial Judges, that the Opinion of the Popes Infallibility, is not only without, but againſt manifeſt reaſon. For,

1. 'Tis certain, that the *Greek*, *Aſiatick* and *Æthiopick* Churches never believ'd, but expreſly oppos'd it.

2. For the Weſtern or Latin Church, it is evident, by their General Councils of *Nice*, *Piſa*, *Conſtance* and *Baſil* (in which ſeveral Popes have been declar'd Hereticks) that they were ſo far from believing it, (tho' Pope *Gregory* the *7th* was for it) that they condemn'd, and Synodically declar'd againſt it, for 1500 years, till *Leo* the *10th* in his *Lateran* Council, in the year 1513. did again ſet on foot that Apocryphal opinion of the Popes Infallibility: So that it is not only erroneous, but a very late and novel invention.

2. *A General Council not Infallible.*

That a General Council is not Infallible, is a truth (from many cogent and undeniable reaſons) ſo evident, that as there is no need I ſhou'd, ſo it is not my purpoſe to ſay much: only I ſhall (in ſhort) ſay a few things, and refer them to your prudence, to make uſe of all, or any of them, as to you (circumſtances conſider'd) may ſeem convenient. Here then I deſire it may be conſider'd,

1. That a General Council is never ſo much as named in Scripture, nor any promiſe of Infallibility given it. The * Council of the Apoſtles (which was no General Council) was Infallible, and might truly ſay * *Sic viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto & nobis.* Becauſe the Apoſtles had the Infallible Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. But that any General Council had any ſuch Aſſiſtance, truly to ſay, after their Decrees, *Sic viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis*; (Tho' that

* *Acts* 15. 28.

that of * *Trent*, and others vainly pretend to it) is an Assertion without all proof or probability.

* Deus ad Ecclesiæ suæ directionem Sanctis Patribus inspirare dignatus est, &c. *Ita* Pius 4. *in Bulla super forma Juramenti Professionis fidei in Concil. Trident. Ed. Antw.* 1633. *p.* 450. *and elsewhere*, Synodus à Deo edocta statuit, &c. *Vid. Conc. Trident. sess.* 13. *de eucharistia in decreto, p.* 121, 122. *dictæ editionis, & sess.* 21. *de Communione, cap.* 1. *p.* 203.

2. But there is no necessity of such an Infallible Guide, as a General Council; because Christians for several Ages, have attain'd Heaven and Eternal Salvation, who never had any General Council to be their Guide. For 'tis certain, and on all sides confess'd, that the first Nicene Council, which was held *An. Christ.* 325. was the first General Council, the Christian Church ever had. Now I desire to know (and you may ask those who endeavour to seduce your Parishioners) whether the Christians in those 325. years, (when there was no General Council) were saved or not? If they were saved, then 'tis evident that a General Council is not necessary to guide us to Heaven; seeing Christians for 325. years obtain'd Salvation, and yet in all that time, there was no General Council to guide them.

But if it be said, Christians (for want of a General Council to guide them) were not saved in those three Centuries; Then,

1. They contradict the sense of Christendom, and the constant testimony of Fathers and Historians, who universally tell us of thousands, not only of pious Christians, but of many hundred thousands of pious Confessors and Martyrs. Now to say that they were not saved, who laid down their lives for Christ and his Gospel, is such an uncharitable and unchristian Censure, as no sober Christian ever did, or (I believe) ever will be guilty of.

2. They contradict their own Martyrologies, their Missals and Breviaries, wherein they acknowledge many hundred Saints and Martyrs who lived and dyed in those 3 Centuries, and in their Offices pray to them, as to glorify'd Saints and Martyrs.

3. But to put the case (in short and) beyond dispute, it is certain there never was any truly General Council, or any Synod wherein the Representatives of the Universal Church did meet and determine Controversies. The greatest Council the Christian Church ever had, was only Imperial, of the Roman Empire, not Universal of all Christendom; few, if any, out of the Roman Empire being ever call'd, or coming to any of those Councils we now call General or Oecumenical. 'Tis true, there are several Councils (as the first of *Nice*, that of *Constantinople*, that of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, &c.) which we commonly call Oecumenical or General Councils; but then the word οἰκυμένη (whence we call a Council Oecumenical) must be taken in that signification it has in * St. *Luke*, *There came a Decree from* Augustus, *that* (πᾶσα οἰκυμένη) *the whole World should be taxed.* Now 'tis evident, that by πᾶσα οἰκυμένη there, the Roman world only must be meant, or the Roman Empire; for *Augustus* had neither intention, nor any Authority to tax any, but his own Subjects. So when the Emperours call'd Councils (as is evident they did call all the first ‖ *Oecumenical* Councils) they had neither Intention, nor any Authority to call those Christians which were out of their Empire, and none of their Subjects. Now 'tis evident that when the

* *Luke* 2. 1.

‖ This is confess'd, & learnedly proved by a Roman Catholick and *Sorbon* Doctor, *Edmund. Richerius in Hist. Conc. Gen. Ed. Colonia* 1680. *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 7. *p.* 6. And what he says there, he afterwards particularly proves.

Nicene

Nicene Council was call'd, and others after it, a very great part of Christendom was without the bounds of the Roman Empire, whose Bishops as they were never call'd, so they never came, as may appear by the Subscriptions to the Councils themselves.

4. Is it not irrational for them to boast of the Infallibility of their General Councils? when their greatest * Writers, and Publishers of their Councils, ridiculously contradict themselves, and give us this distinction of General Councils. 1. *Generalia Concilia approbata.* 2. *Concilia Gen. reprobata.* 3. *Concilia Gen. partim approbata, partim reprobata.* 4. *Concilium Gen. nec approbatum nec reprobatum.* They mean the first of *Pisa*, about the year, 1409 which they will not ‖ approve nor reject. In short, if General Councils may be reprobate and rejected, then sure they are not Infallible.

* *Vid. Bellarm. de Concil. &c. lib. 1. cap. 6, 7.*

‖ *Vid. Longum à Coriolano in compendio Conciliorum Rom.* 1614. *p.* 290, 291. They will not approve it, because it condemn'd and depos'd 2 Popes, as Schismaticks and Hereticks, and they dare not condemn it, because it made *Alexander* the 5*th* Pope, whom they reckon in the Series of their true Popes; which he could not be, if that Council had not a just power to make him so.

5. It seems your Emissaries (to perswade your People to desert the Church of *England*) tell your Parishioners, that the Church of *England* is in a miserable condition for want of (what they have) an Infallible Guide and Judge of Controversies.

For hence it is (say they) that our Church is divided into so many Sects and Factions, some being Presbyterians, some Independents, some Quakers, *&c.* To this you may with great reason and truth reply; That they have in the Roman Church, more Sects and Factions, than we have in *England*; & they differing in things of an higher nature, such as concern the Being of the Papacy.

For, to ſay nothing of the late great, and hot differences and diſputes between the *Janſeniſts* and *Moliniſts*, between the *Dominicans* and their Adherents on the one ſide, and the Jeſuits and Franciſcans on the other: Their Church is divided into great Sects and Factions, which differ in things which concern the foundation of their Church and Papacy.

For, (to omit others) many in their Church publickly affirm and maintain, 1. That the Pope is Infallible. 2. That he is the Supream Head of their Church above all General Councils, and that no Appeal lies from him to the Council. 3. That his Supremacy is not only in this Eccleſiaſtical, but (at leaſt *indirectè*) in temporals too. 4. That he has power to depoſe Kings, (as for other cauſes ſo) for Hereſie; 5. and to abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and give away their Kingdoms.

And altho' theſe Opinions paſs (with approbation) at *Rome*, yet they are all (of them) deny'd and condemn'd by the Church of * *France*, and thouſands more, who publickly and in Print declare againſt them as Erroneous and Impious, highly *prejudicial* to the Rights of Kings and temporal Princes, and Inconſiſtent with the Peace of Chriſtendom. Now if our Sects in *England*, have riſen and continued, becauſe we have no Infallible Judge to determine the Controverſie; Then (by a parity of Reaſon) ſeeing their great Sects and differences in the Church of *Rome*, remain undetermin'd; it muſt follow, that they want an Infallible Judge to determine thoſe Controverſies. So that it is (to give it no worſe name) a very ſtrange confidence in your Roman Emiſſaries, to think they can perſwade Proteſtants to deſert the Church of *England*, becauſe there are ſome Sects and Divi-

* *In their Declaration of* March 23. 1662.

Diviſions in it; and yet perſwade them to Communicate with the Church of *Rome*, in which there are far more and more material Sects, and undetermin'd Diviſions: for this were (as the Country Proverb is) to perſwade us out of the Frying Pan into the fire, and (inſtead of bettering it) to put us in a worſe condition.

Let them make it appear, that they are indeed at Unity amongſt themſelves, and no Sects or Diviſions amongſt them; then this Argument may have ſome more ſhew of Probability; but (as the caſe now ſtands) it is not only irrational, but ridiculous. I ſay, ſome more ſhew of Probability, yet no juſt proof. For admit they were at Unity amongſt themſelves, yet there are many other groſs Errors and Superſtitions, which (while retain'd by their Church) makes all Communion with them impoſſible; but enough of this (if not too much) for nothing can be (to an Intelligent and Impartial Judge) more evident than this; That ſince the deceaſe of the Apoſtles, there never was any Man or Congregation or Council of Men, who pretended to Infallibility for above a thouſand years after our Bleſſed Saviour.

But the *Roman* Church is ſo far from having (what ſhe commonly and vainly boaſts of) Infallibility, that there neither is, nor ever was any Chriſtian Church in the world in ſuch a miſerable condition; for the great incertainty of her Faith and Religion; which incertainty ariſes from her own Principles, approv'd and receiv'd by the Supream Authority of that Church, and they are two,

1. From their requiring the Intention of the Miniſter, as neceſſary to the real Being of every Sacrament.
2. Their denying the certainty of our Senſes.

1. For

1. For the first, that the Intention of the Minister is necessarily requir'd to the real Being of any Sacrament; We have the Decree of * Pope *Eugenius* expressly affirming it; and he says (tho' ‖ untruly) that it was *approbante Concilio*; Their * *Trent* Council confirms the same, as do other of their ‖ Authentick Books. Now this Principle being (as it is) by them granted, it evidently follows,

* *Sacramentum tribus perficitur, Materia, Forma, & Intentione Ministri. Quorum si aliquod desit, non perficitur Sacramentum.* *Apud Binium Concil. Tom. 8. p. 865. col. 1. D ed. Paris. 1636.* ‖ *Vid. D.* Crakanthorp. *contr Spalatens. cap. 72. p. 530, 531. & Christoph. à capite Fontium de necess. correct. Theol. Scholastica, p. 51. 56.* * *Concil. Trident. Sess. 7. de Sacramentis, can. 11.* ‖ *Rituale Rom. Antw. 1652. p. 6. Missale Romanum Antw. 1619. in principio, de defectibus circa Missam. 7.*

1. That no man in their Church can be certain that he is a Christian, or that there is any one true Christian in the whole Church of *Rome*. For if they be not baptiz'd, then 'tis certain they are no Christians, nor Members of the Visible Church; and that they are truly Baptiz'd is impossible for man certainly to know. For if the Minister who Baptiz'd him, did not intend it, he is not Baptiz'd; and what the Minister intended, God only (who knows the heart and our Intentions) can certainly know. It is true, if I Baptize any Person, I may certainly know my own Intentions, that I did intend to baptize him; and so I may be certain he is truly Baptiz'd; but whether he who Baptiz'd me, did intend it, is impossible for me certainly to know. So that although I may certainly know that another man is truly Baptiz'd, yet no man in the Church of *Rome*, can be certain that he is so. All the assurance I can have, that I am truly Baptiz'd, and a Member of the Christian Church, is, from the Minister who Baptiz'd me. But he being always Fallible, and (for ought I do or can know) may be

be false; such a testimony cannot assure me that I am truly Baptiz'd, and indeed a Christian, within the Church; and then seeing---*Extra Ecclesiam non est salus*, it follows, that (for ought I do or can know) I am in a miserable and damnable condition.

Now suppose a General Council, call'd by the Pope or Emperor, if they are not Christians, I may be sure they are not Infallible Judges; God (as is and must be confess'd) having never promised Infallible assistance to any without the Christian Church: and that they are Christians I can never certainly know, because 'tis impossible for me to be assur'd that they have been truly Baptiz'd, by any Minister really intending it.

Now admit they were Infallible Judges, yet they cannot be so to me; who can never be sure they are so. For I can have no more Assurance of their Infallibility, than I have of their Christianity, of which 'tis impossible for me to be assur'd, seeing it is impossible for me certainly to know, whether they be Baptiz'd.

2. Upon the same Principle it is impossible for any certainly to know, whether there be any one true Priest in the whole Papacy; and consequently that there is any true Bishop, (for it is certain, every true Bishop must be a Priest) now if none can be certain that there is any true Bishop or Priest in the *Roman* Church; then (seeing it is certain, that Bishops and Priests, and true Orders are necessary to the Being of a True Church) it evidently follows, that they are so far from being certain, that their Church is Infallible; that they neither are, nor can be certain, that their Church is any True Church at all.

3. Upon the same Principle, (Marriage being with them a Sacrament, and the Intention of the Minister

ſter who marries any, being neceſſary to make the Marriage good and valid) all marryed People in the Church of *Rome*, for ought they do, or can know (not knowing the Intention of the Prieſt who marryed them) may live in perpetual fornication, and their children (if they have any) illegitimate, as begot by Fornication, and not in lawful Marriage.

4. And on the ſame Principle, none in the Church of *Rome*, can be certain, that the Bread in the Euchariſt is truly Conſecrate, (becauſe the Prieſts intention, who Conſecrates, cannot poſſibly be known to them) and if it be not truly Conſecrate, it (as is confeſs'd) remains Bread, and then (as is confeſs'd too) they in Worſhipping it, are moſt impious Idolaters, worſe than they of * *Lapland*, who worſhip a piece of Red Cloth, *&c.* So that this is the miſerable condition of all Communicants in the Church of *Rome*, that (for ought they do, or can certainly know) they are moſt impious Idolaters.

* *Si in Euchariſtia, Verum Corpus Chriſti non contineatur, Adoratio ejus talis erit Idololatria, qualis in orbe terrarum nunquam audita erat. Tolerabilior enim erit eorum error, qui pro Deo colunt ſtatuam auream, vel pannum rubrum in haſta elevatum, quod de Lappis narratur, &c.* Ita Coſterus in Enchiridio controverſiarum, *Colon. Agrip.* 1587. *cap.* 8. *pag.* 301.

Now let any intelligent and pious Perſon judge, whether our moſt wiſe and gracious God hath left his Church in ſuch a miſerable condition, that it ſhou'd be in the power of wicked Miniſters, to make all his People abominable Idolaters.

2. The Second thing I nam'd, from which the great incertainty of the *Roman* Churches Religion (tho' they vainly brag of Infallibility) ariſes, is their denying the certainty of our Senſes. For this being deny'd, it will evidently follow, that the Roman Catholicks neither have, nor can have any certainty of their Religion: That this may appear, conſider,

1. That

1. That our Bleſſed Saviour ordain'd his Apoſtles to *be* * *Witneſs* of his Reſurrection, and that he had a real Body, and was not a Spirit. * *Luke* 24.48. *Act.* 1.8.22.

2. And that they might be ſufficient Witneſſes, He appear'd ſeveral times to them, that they might ‖ *ſee*, and *touch*, and *handle* * *him*; blames them for not believing thoſe who had ſeen him after his Reſurrection; and S. *Luke* tells us, that *theſe* ‖ *were infallible proofs* of his Reſurrection, *&c.* and ſo thinks S. * *John* too. ‖ *Luk.* 24. 39. *Joh.* 20. 27. * *Mar.* 16.14. ‖ *Act.* 1. 3. * 1 *John* 1. 1.

3. The *Roman* Catholicks deny this certainty of our Senſes, and tell us; that the Bread in the Euchariſt after Conſecration, is not Bread, but the very glorifyed Body of our Bleſſed Saviour; (tho' all our Senſes aſſure us, That 'tis Bread ſtill) and tell us that we muſt not truſt our Senſes, but believe it to be his Body. Well, ask them how they know it is his Body? they ſay by Faith; but how came they by that Faith? They ſay (as the Text ſaith) by * *hearing*: But then 1. Senſe (they ſay) is no certain Aſſurer of what we have by it. 2. If all my five Senſes may be deceiv'd, in judging the Wafer to be Bread, certainly their Hearing, (which is but one) may be deceiv'd: And then all their Faith, and the certainty of it, depending upon their Hearing (none of the Senſes according to their Principles, being to be truſted in matters of Faith, becauſe they may deceive us) it manifeſtly follows, That they are ſo far from Infallibility, that they neither have, nor can have any (ſo much as moral) certainty of any thing they Believe. But (if not too much) enough of this. For indeed, their pretences to Infallibility are ſo weak, that they deſerve no confutation. * *Rom.* 10.17.

I come now to the second thing, which you desir'd me to do; that is, to give some Reasons to justifie *our Separation from Rome*, that it may appear, that we are not (what they commonly miscal us) Schismaticks. And here it is to be consider'd,

1. That Schism (to pass by all other significations of the word) is a *Criminal or sinful* violation, or a breach of Ecclesiastical or Church-Union, which Union is two fold,
   1. *Internal*, consisting in an Union of Judgment, and that mutual Love and Charity which Christians ought to have mutually one to another.
   2. *External*, consisting in an outward profession of the same Faith, Communion in the same Liturgies and Sacred Offices and Sacraments.
2. Schism, (as now we speak of it) does not consist in a violation or breach of that Internal Union of Judgment and Love (tho' this may, and is call'd Schism * in Scripture, and is a sin) for such Internal Divisions, and breach of the Union of Love and Judgment, are not of humane cognizance, nor can the Church know who are, or censure, such Schismaticks.

* 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. where νοῦς refers to the mind, and γνώμη to the will, (for the word does properly and usually signifie the will) and so, some Learned Papists render the words; *In eadem sententia, & eadem voluntate*. So *Hen. Holden*, a Sorbon Dr. on this place, 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. in his Notes.

3. But Schism (in the sense we now speak of) consists in a Violation or breach of the External Church-Union, when men refuse to Communicate with their Fellow-Christians, in the Belief of the same Creed, coming to the same publick Prayers, and receiving the same Sacraments, *&c.*
4. This Schism must be a Criminal or Sinful Separation; when those who separate have no Rational

nal and firm grounds to justifie their Separation. For if any Church hath Apostatiz'd from the Ancient and true Christian Faith, and (as necessary conditions of her Communion) require of her Members, to believe any thing *in fide* erroneous, or to do any thing *in facto* impious; then Separation from such a corrupted Church, is so far from being Schismatical and sinful Impiety; that it is a * *necessary duty*. This is on all *sides* ‖ *confessed*, that 'tis no Schism to Separate from an erroneous Church; It being evident that no Christian can be bound to Communicate with any Church in Errors or Impieties; and therefore may without any Schism, lawfully Separate from such Churches, whether that Church disbelieve and deny any Articles of the Ancient and True Christian Faith, or (which the Pope and his party do) add new ones, inconsistent with it, and the truth of the Gospel, and that Faith which our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles deliver'd to the Christian Church.

* *Vid Rev* 18.4

‖ *Sine Schismate decedere possumus ab iis, qui à veritate deviant--* vid. Joverium *de Conc. part.* 1. *p.* 203. *col.* 2.

The Premisses concerning the Nature of Schism, consider'd, and (as they are and must be) granted: I say, That the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, are so many, and grievous, that they are a just ground to condemn Her, and to justifie our Separation from her. I shall only instance in some few; and the first * concerns the *Sacred Scripture*; which,

* 1. Reason, From their vilifying and prohibiting the Scripture in any vulgar tongue.

1. Many of her Writers speak most irreverently of the Sacred Scriptures (tho' they be on all sides confess'd to be the Holy Word of God) calling them *nasus* ‖ *Cereus*, *Regula Lesbia*, *Unsens'd Characters*, &c. These and many more such occur in their greatest Writers, as is notoriously known,

‖ *Vid. Pigbium, controver.* 3 *de Ecclesia, p.* 71. *col.* 2. *ed.* 1542.

And there his impious Blaspheming of the Holy Scriptures.

and cannot be deny'd. Sure I am, that She her ſelf * tells us---*That the reading of Scripture in any Vulgar tongue, has (by reaſon of mens raſhneſs) done more miſchief than good.* And therefore the Church of *Rome* forbids all Reading the Scriptures in any Vulgar Tongue; which conſequence (notwithſtanding her Infallibility) is moſt irrational, and not better than this---None ſhall drink any Wine, becauſe many, through their temerity and drunkenneſs abuſe it, to their great hurt and detriment. But this is not all, nor (tho' bad enough) the worſt of it. Other ‖ of their Authors (approv'd at *Rome*) tell us; That the reading of Scripture in a vulgar Tongue, is ſo far from being profitable, that it is pernicious to the people: Nay (*horreſco referens*) They farther ſay---That the permitting of the People to read the Bible was the **Invention of the Devil**, and *a likelier means to build Babylon, than Jeruſalem.* Having thus given ſo foul a character of the *Holy Scriptures*, to fright men ſoom reading them as dangerous, and to the People pernicious; they do in the next place

2. Abſolutely * *prohibit* the reading or hearing the Bible, or any Summary or Compendium of it, in any vulgar Tongue, underſtood by the People; and if any have any prohibited Books, they are to bring them to the Biſhop or Inquiſitor, who are preſently to ſee them burnt, ‖ (the Bible not excepted) for it is, *all* * *prohibited* Books whatſoever, *&c.*

* *Vid. Indicem Librorum prohibitorum ex Conc. Trident. præſcript. &c. & ibi Regul. 4. Si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua paſſim ſine diſcrimine permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem Detrimenti quam Utilitatis oriri.*

‖ The Authors, and their words and Books where they are to be found, are punctually (and truly) quoted to my hand, by D. *Crakanthorp cont. Archiep. Spalat. c.* 13. *S.* 13. *p* 61. *vid. Azor. Inſt. moral. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 8. *cap.* 26. *p.* 83.

* *vid. Regulam* 4. *Indicis dicti, ſupra citatam, & obſervationem ad dictam Regulam, & Bullam* Clem. 8. *datam Tuſc.* 17. *Oct.* 1595. ‖ *V. Bull.* Greg. 15. *dat. Rom. dec.* 30. *A.* 1622.

* *Libros quomodolibet prohibitos*; So the title of that Bull, and the Bull it ſelf.

Now this giving ſuch an irreverent character of Holy Scripture, and prohibiting the reading or hearing

ing it in any vulgar Tongue, is not only erroneous, but highly unjuſt, and (to the People, who are deny'd the * *benefit* and comfort they might receive by reading the Scriptures) pernicious, which will evidently appear; becauſe ſuch prohibition of reading or hearing the Bible, in any vulgar Language, is expreſly contrary * *Rom* 15.4.

1. To the Scripture it ſelf.
2. To the command and precepts of God in It.
3. To the practice of the Church of God, (both Jewiſh and Chriſtian) as may and (to intelligent and impartial Judges) will evidently appear.

1. For the Jewiſh Church; 'tis undeniably certain, 1. *The Jewiſh Church.*
1. That the Sacred Books of the Old Teſtament, were (either immediately by God himſelf, or mediately by his Prophets) given to the Jews in their own vulgar Tongue.

2. That they were not given only to the *Levites*, or learned amongſt the Jews, but to ‖ *all Iſrael* (*Levites* or Laity) *Remember* (ſaies the Prophet) *the Law of Moſes, which I commanded in Horeb for all Iſrael, with the Statutes and Judgments.* ‖ *Mal.* 4.4.

3. And by the expreſs * *command of God*, they were bound to read that Law, in that vulgar Language, to all *Iſrael*, men, women, and children, and to that end, that they *might* ‖ *learn* to fear the Lord, and keep his Statutes. * *Deut.* 31.11. ‖ *verſ.* 12.13.

4. And accordingly (*in praxi & de facto*) it was read in their vulgar Tongue, to men, * women and children; and afterwards both the Law and Prophets were read in every Synagogue, every ‖ Sabbath day. * *Neh.* 8.2,3. ‖ *Act.* 13.15.27.

5. And that they had the Scriptures in the vulgar Tongue, and could read and be directed by them (as divine.

* *Rom.* 3.1,2. ‖ *Psal.* 1,1,2. *Joshua* 1.8 See that signal place to this purpose. *Hosea* 8.12. condemning their neglect of reading Scriptures, which God gave them for that end, that they should read and consider them.

divine Oracles) was the * *greatest* and most profitable privilege, and the ‖ *man* is Bless'd, who read and did meditate in them day and night, *&c.*

The Premisses consider'd, I think 'tis evident, that their undervaluing the Scriptures, and prohibiting the reading them in any vulgar Tongue, is directly contradictory to the express command of God, and practice of *the Jewish Church* (the only true Church then) before our Blessed Saviour had constituted the Christian Church of Jews and Gentiles.

2. *The Christian Church.*

2. Concerning the Christian Church; That the Scriptures were had and read by Christians, (either in the Originals, or in Versions, and Translations into other vulgar Tongues) is an undeniable truth, and indeed confess'd. For 'tis manifest, that all Churches in Christendom * anciently had, and (except the *Roman*) to this day have the Scriptures, and read them, in their vulgar Tongues; and the Church of *Rome* had, and read the Scriptures in Latin, (which was for many ages their vulgar Tongue) till it did degenerate into *Italian*. 2. The Apostle commends *Timothy*, that he had *known the Scriptures from a* ‖ *child, and that they were able to make him wise unto Salvation*; or (as S. *James* expresseth it *) *able to save his soul.* The Scriptures, which *Timothy* is said to know from a child, were the Scriptures of the Old Testament, (little, if any, of the New being then writ, when he was a child) which he had and read in a vulgar Tongue; and such reading was so far from being (what the Popish Writers, and the Popes themselves say of them) dangerous and pernicious to his Soul; that (if we will believe the Apostle)

* *Vid.* Brerewood's *Inquiries, cap.* 26. *p.* 190, 191. *&c. ed. Lond.* 1633.

‖ 2 *Tim.* 3.15. ἀπὸ βρέφους, *statim ab Infantia.*

* *James* 1.21.

Apoſtle) it was a happy and powerful means for the Salvation of it. 3. St. *Paul* * preaches the Goſpel to the Jews at *Berea*: they had, and daily ſearch'd the Scriptures, whether thoſe things which *Paul* preach'd, were ſo. The Apoſtle commends them for it, and ſhews them the great benefit and bleſſing they gain'd by doing it. *They daily ſearched the Scriptures, Therefore* (ſays he) *Many of* ‖ *them believed.* Their having and reading the Scriptures (the Old Teſtament) in their vulgar Tongue, was a happy and powerful cauſe and means of their Believing the Goſpel, which S. *Paul* preach'd. 4. S. *John* aſſures us, that the Goſpel was by him writ to that very end, *That* * *we might believe, and have eternal Life.*

* *Acts* 17. 11, 12.

‖ *verſ.* 12.

* *Joh.* 20. 31.

The Reading and Knowing of the Scriptures was the means God himſelf had appointed to bring us to true Faith and Salvation: and therefore to forbid all reading or hearing the Scriptures in a vulgar and (to the People) intelligible Language, is to contradict God and his Apoſtles, and to deprive men of the great and effectual means of their Salvation. 5. S. *Peter* writing to the diſperſed *Jews* (who by God's appointment had, and read the Scriptures in their vulgar Tongue) he admoniſheth and requires them; *That as new-born babes they ſhould* ‖ *deſire the ſincere milk of the word, that they might grow thereby.* As the Mothers milk is a wholeſom nouriſhment for young Children, to preſerve and promote a temporal life; ſo (in S. *Peter*'s Judgment) the Scriptures are a wholeſom nouriſhment for young Chriſtians to preſerve and promote a Spiritual Life, and therefore he exhorts them to deſire the ſincere *milk of the word, that they may grow thereby:* And farther, as to take away Milk from new-born Children, were evidently injuſt

‖ 1 Pet. 2. 2. & *Vide Occumenium, Parcum, Eſtium, Gagnaium in Locum.*

juſt in it ſelf, and pernicious to the Children; ſo to take away the Scriptures from young Children in Chriſt, would be equally (or rather more) impious in him who ſhould take them away, and more pernicious to them from whom they are taken. Becauſe taking away the Mothers milk from Infants, and young Children, is only prejudicial to the Body, and a temporal Life; but to take away the Scriptures from young (or any) Chriſtians, is prejudicial to their Souls and Salvation. 6. But altho' S. *Peter* exhorts the *Jews* to deſire the ſincere milk of the Word, that is to read and underſtand it, for the benefit of their Souls; for he well knew that they had the Scriptures given by God himſelf, in their vulgar Tongue, and that there was none then, who would hinder them to read them. And tho' our Bleſſed Saviour * *commanded* the Jews *to ſearch the Scriptures*, to bring them to the knowledge and belief that he was the true Meſſiah, and ſo to eternal Life. And altho' S. *Paul* commands the *Coloſſians* that ‖ his Epiſtle to them be read to the Brethren in *Laodicea*, and that the Epiſtle from * *Laodicea* be read to the *Coloſſians*. Now tho' thoſe Epiſtles were writ in *Greek*, a vulgar and well known language to the *Coloſſians*, and *Laodiceans*; yet S. *Paul* commands that they be publickly read in both Churches. But let *Peter* and *Paul*, and our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf, ſay what he will for diligently reading and ſearching the Scriptures in any vulgar, and (to the people) known Tongue; his pretended Vicar, in contradiction to our Bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles, does abſolutely condemn all ſuch Reading of Scripture, as dangerous, and (to the people) pernicious.

* *Joh.* 5. 39. *Joh.* 10. 25, 26, 28.

‖ *Col.* 4. 16. *The Epiſt. to the Coloſſ. was writ, An. Chriſt.* 60.

* *The* 1. *Epiſt. to Timothy was writ from Laodicea (A. Chr.* 52.) *Vide ſubſcriptionem,* 1. *Ep. ad Timoth.*

Laſtly,

Laſtly, you may (if you think it convenient, and have an opportunity) propoſe this caſe to your Popiſh Emiſſary (who ever he be) that endeavours to ſeduce your Pariſhioners from truth, and the Church of *England*. Suppoſe *Sempronius*, a great and very rich man, make his laſt Will and Teſtament, and divide his eſtate amongſt his Children, and give many conſiderable Legacies to his Friends and Servants; and in his Will particularly expreſſes what, and to whom, and upon what conditions his Legacies are bequeath'd: now *Sempronius* dyes, and ſome great man has got his Will into his hand and keeping, and (it being a Will in a Language not underſtood by the Legatees) will neither let them have the Will, nor a true and atteſted copy of it, in a Language they underſtand: So that they cannot be aſſur'd, nor any way certainly know, either who are (by the Will) Legatees, or what the Legacies are, or upon what conditions they are given; ſave only, as he who keeps the Will, ſhall be pleaſed to ſignifie to them; who (if he be not an honeſt man) may cheat and couſin them, and they have no remedy to ſecure their right, eſpecially, if he who keeps the Will be, or pretend to be a ſupream Power, from whom lyes no appeal to any ſuperiour Judge, who might examine the cauſe, and do them juſtice. In this caſe, 'tis moſt evident, that he who keeps the Will is unjuſt in himſelf, and injurious to the Legatees, in keeping them from the knowledge of the Teſtators Will, and ſo from the knowledg of what he has given them. This being granted, (as of neceſſity it ought and muſt) you may deſire him (as a like caſe) to conſider,

1. That our Bleſſed Saviour even as Man, and our Mediator was *very* * *great*, the *Prince of Peace*, and *head of his Church*. * *Matth.* 28. 18. *Phil.* 2. 8, 9, 10.

 2. That

2. That he liv'd and dy'd for his Church, and in his Will, left exceeding great Legacies to his Saints and Servants, with the conditions he required of the Legatees, to make them capable of thoſe Legacies.

3. That the Goſpel was his laſt Will and Teſtament, in which, who are Legatees, and upon what conditions their Legacies become due, are particularly expreſs'd.

4. His Will was writ in a Language the People do not now underſtand; and the Biſhop of *Rome* having got it into his hand, and pretending that he (as Vicar of Chriſt) is the *ſole* * *Supream keeper* of it, does abſolutely deny the People any copy of it in any vulgar Language, by them underſtood; and ſo deprives them of the knowledge of their Bleſſed Saviour's Will and Teſtament, of the gracious Promiſes, and great Legacies given in it, and of the holy Precepts and conditions required of the People, to give them a right to thoſe Legacies. So that (in contradiction to our Bleſſed Saviour's expreſs command) they muſt neither ſearch or read, or have the Goſpel (in any vulgar Tongue by them underſtood) upon pain of Excommunication. They are not permitted to read the Goſpel, nor muſt they truſt to their own eyes and underſtanding, (tho' given them by God for that purpoſe) but they muſt believe the Church, and the Pope (or rather an ordinary Prieſt from him) muſt tell them, what Legacies are given, and what Duties are requir'd by

* *See that ſignal Bull of Pope* Clement *the* 9th *dated at* Rome, *An.* 1668. *in which we have theſe words,* --Debitum Paſtoralis Officii, quo Eccleſiæ Catholicæ per Univerſum orbem diffuſæ regimini, divina diſpoſitione preſidemus, exigit, ut Sacras Scripturas in puritate illibatas cuſtodire ſatagamus, &c. *In which Bull he condemns the Tranſlation of the vulgar Latin into French, becauſe the differences of the vulgar Latin from the Greek, are noted.*

by our Bleſſed Saviour in the Goſpel. Now in the former caſe, if the keeping *Sempronius* his Will from the Legatees was evidently unjuſt, and injurious to the Legatees: much more will the detaining our Bleſſed Saviour's Will from his People (the Salvation of whoſe Souls, are ſo highly concern'd in it) be unjuſt in the Pope and his party; and not only injurious, but pernicious to the People. For in *Sempronius* his Will, the Legacies were only temporal things, and ſo the loſs of them leſs conſiderable: But in our Bleſſed Saviour's Will and Teſtament, the Legacies are Spiritual, the promiſes of Grace here, and eternal Glory hereafter; and therefore to take away the Goſpel from the People in any Language underſtood by them, ſo that they cannot certainly know the Promiſes, or their duties requir'd for the attaining of them; is (as I ſaid) not only injurious but pernicious to the poor people, detain'd from the only means to know thoſe things, which (in order to their Salvation) they are (by the Law of God and the Goſpel) bound to know. For 1. Without the knowledge of Chriſt, and belief in him, there is no poſſibility of Salvation, (*Joh.* 3. 16. *Act.* 10. 43. *Joh.* 17. 3.) And 2. ſuch knowledge of our Bleſſed Saviour, whereon we may fiducially, and with certainty rely, can no where be had but in Scripture, the only Infallible rule of our Faith. 3. Now the Pope and his party, ſeverely prohibiting the People to read, or have the Scriptures (or any part of them) in any vulgar Language which they underſtand, do by conſequence deprive them of the only ſure, and certain means of their Salvation. Which how unbecoming it is, the pretended Succeſſor of S. *Peter*

(who was commanded by our Bleſſed Saviour, to feed his Sheep, not to famiſh them, by taking the Scriptures from them) and how pernicious to the poor People, let the Reader judge. 4. And that the Pope (*quantum in ſe eſt*) deprives the People of the knowledge of Scripture (beſides what is above ſaid) I ſhall only add a ſignal paſſage out of a late Popes Bull, wherein he condemns a French Tranſlation of their own vulgar Latine in theſe words, * *The ſaid Gallican Verſion of the New Teſtament, whereſoever Printed, or hereafter to be Printed, as raſh, and miſchievous, differing from the vulgar Latin, and ſcandalous to the ignorant; We (by our Apoſtolical Authority) condemn and prohibit: ſo that hereafter, none, of what Degree or condition ‖ ſoever he be, under pain of Excommunication, ſhall dare, or preſume to read, have, ſell, print, or cauſe it to be printed: and whoſoever has that French Tranſlation of the N. Teſtament, he is bound under pain of Excommunication to deliver it preſently to the Ordinary of the place, or the Inquiſitors, notwithſtanding any thing whatſoever, which may be to the contrary.* Thus Pope *Clement* the 9*th.* (about 20 years ſince) condemns and prohibits the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt in *French*, (a vulgar Tongue) and we are told by a great and learned Caſuiſt of their own, that long before him, *Innocent* the 3*d.* condemned, and

* *See the Bull of* Clement *the* 9*th. cited a little before. where the Pope ſays.*—Librum Verſionis Gallicanæ N. Teſtamenti, ubicunque impreſſum, vel imprimendum, tanquam temerarium, damnoſum, à vulgata editione deformem, & offendicula ſimplicium continentem, authoritate Apoſtolicâ damnamus, & prohibemus: ita ut nemo deinceps, cujuſcunque gradûs aut conditionis exiſtat, ſub pœna Excommunicationis latæ ſententiæ ipſo facto incurrendæ illum legere, retinere, vendere, aut imprimere, vel imprimi facere audeat vel præſumat; ſed ſub eadêm pœna, quicunque illum habeat, locorum ordinariis, ſeu inquiſitoribus, ſtatim exhibere teneatur: In contrarium facientibus non obſtantibus quibuſcunque. *Bulla data eſt Romæ* 20 *April.* 1668.

‖ *Even Kings and Princes are forbid (under pain of Excommunication) to have, or read the Scriptures in any vulgar Tongue: contrary to the expreſs command of God, Deut.* 17. 18, 19.

and prohibited a *French* Tranſlation of the Bible. * *Azorius* (in the place cited) gives the reaſons, why the Scriptures are not to be permitted to be read, or had in any vulgar Tongue; where his irreverent ſpeeches of the holy Word of God, are ſo many and horrid, that I ſhall not offend the pious Reader, nor pollute theſe papers with them: he, who would be ſatisfied, may ſee them in the place ‖ cited.

* *Azorius Inſtitutionum moral. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 8. *c.* 26. *quæſt.* 4. *pag.* 830, 831.

‖ *And much more in many others, eſpecially in* Alphonſus à caſtro adverſus Hæreſes. *lib.* 1. *c* 13. *à p.* 78. *ad p.* 83. *inclusivè, edit. Pariſ.* 1571. *& vide Heſium de Expoſ Dei verbi, p.* 640. *Where he ſays, that to permit the people to read the Scripture, eſt margaritas è orcis conculcandas projicere--But tho' Hoſius (and the Pope too) be of that opinion, that the people are Hogs and Swine--yet S.* Peter *was of another opinion,* 1 Pet. 2. 9.

The Premiſſes conſider'd, I believe that intelligent and impartial Judges, (who love and ſeek truth) will think, that we had juſt reaſon to forſake the Church of *Rome*, which unjuſtly (in contradiction to Scripture and the practice of all Chriſtian Churches, (except her ſelf) took the Holy Scriptures from us, and conſequently depriv'd us of the happineſs which God himſelf had given us, to be a ſure and ſufficient ground of our ſpiritual comfort, and hope of Heaven. For (tho' they are pleas'd to contradict it) the Apoſtle * *aſſures us, That whatever things were written aforetime, were written for our Learning, that we through patience, and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope.* The Scriptures were dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, and given to the Church (not to be lockt up in an unknown Language, but) for our Learning, and a firm foundation of our comfort and hope of Heaven.

* *Rom.* 15. 4.

2. The Goſpel was dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, and given to this very end, that it might be an effectual and *powerful means to bring us to true Faith, and*

by

by it to eternal life; So the * Apostle (or Holy Spirit by him) tells us--*These things are written, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and believing them might have life.*

* *Joh.* 20.31.

3. Nor is the Scripture an imperfect and defective means, or (without Traditions) unable to beget such a Faith, as will bring us to eternal life: For the Apostle (who knew better) expresly tells *Timothy*, ‖ That the *Scriptures were* * *ABLE to make him wise unto Salvation.*

‖ 2 Tim 3.15.
* δυνάμενα, *Ib.*

4. Lastly, Nor are the Scriptures so obscurely penn'd, (as they are commonly, and most unjustly slander'd by our Adversaries) that to ordinary people, and understandings they are unintelligible. I shall not go about to prove this, (being abundantly done by many of our Protestant Divines already,) I shall only add one testimony of a Cardinal (I mean *Bessarion*) who at the Council of ‖ *Florence*, in a Speech to his Countrey-men, expresly says; *That in Scripture ALL Doctrines of Faith, are either plainly explain'd, or if they be hid, they may without difficulty be found out.* This Assertion of *Bessarion*, is (to me and all Protestants) an evident and clear truth; and is more considerable, in that a *Roman* Cardinal dares, and does publickly attest it, in contradiction to the receiv'd Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. And while I am writing this, there providentially comes in my way, something concerning the taking away the Scriptures from the people, which (if I mistake not) is very pertinent to our present purpose. For,

‖ *In Sacris Scripturis omnis fidei veritas aut planè explicata est, aut latens, sine difficultate exui potest, vid.* Joverium, *Conciliorum Part.* 1. *p.*203. *col.*3.

1. I find that * *Dioclesian* in his Bloody Persecution of the Christians, published an Edict; that the Christians should bring in their Bibles, to be ‖ *publickly burnt.* They knew (by the suggestion of Satan and

* *Eusebius Hist. Eccl. l.*8. *c.*2. *p.* 293. *edit. Vales.*
‖ Τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι, *Ib. p.*294. *See Nicephorus, lib.* 7. *cap.* 3.

and their Pagan Priests) that the Scriptures were the great and most effectual means to convert Pagans to Christianity, and confirm them in it; and therefore they did cunningly and impiously endeavour to deprive the Christians of the Benefit of those Sacred Books; because no other Books were so destructive of their Pagan Religion, and therefore they might not read them.

2. And let sober and pious men consider, whether the Pope does not for the same reason forbid the Scriptures to the People; because no other Books make a clearer discovery of their Errors. For they absolutely * forbid the Bible in any vulgar Language whatsoever; so that none of their Superiors could ‖ *Licence* them to have it, and yet * permit the abominable *Turkish* Alcoran to be read in a vulgar Tongue. This may justly seem strange, that the Gospel of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, shall be absolutely prohibited, and yet the *Turkish* Alcoran permitted to be read in a vulgar Tongue.

* *Vid. Indicem librorum probibitorum Alexandri 7. Romæ, 1664. verbo Biblia.* Ubi prohibentur Bibliaquocunq; vulgari idiomate scripta.

‖ *Vide Regulas* * *Vide dictum Indici librorum Prohibitorum Tridentino præfixum, in observatione ad Reg. 4. Indicem Alexandri 7. Romæ, 1664. verbo Alcoran' (ubi sic habetur.*—Alchoranus Mahometis Lingua vulgari ex concessione Inquisitorum haberi possit.

3. Tho' the Pagans permitted not the Christians to have the Scriptures, yet never any Christian Church (no not the *Roman*) for above 1000 years after our Blessed Saviour, depriv'd the People of the use and benefit of the Sacred Scriptures. In * *France* they had the Scriptures in their vulgar Tongue, till Pope *Innocent* the third, (which was somewhat above 1200 ‖ years after our Blessed Saviour) condemn'd and prohibited the reading or hearing the Scriptures in any vulgar Idiome. And amongst impertinent things (which they miscall reasons)

* *Vid.* Azorium *Inst Moralium. Tom.* 1. *l.* 8. *c.* 26 *Quæst.* 4. *p.* 830. *Ed. Lugd.* 1625.

‖ *Pope* Innocent *the third was made Pope, An.* 1198.

reaſons) which they then (and others ſince) alledg'd againſt reading Scripture in a vulgar Tongue; this was one; --- That *ſuch* * *reading of the Scriptures would be the cauſe of ſeveral Hereſies, Seditions, Schiſms, and almoſt infinite other miſchiefs.* Certainly all good Chriſtians, who (as ſurely they are bound) love God and the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, will judge this to be (what indeed it is) not ſober reaſoning, but railing at, and reviling the Holy Scriptures, and that Holy Spirit who did dictate them, to be a proper and powerful means, to bring us to the knowledge of the truth, and ‖ Salvation by it. For if the Scripture be not a good means to procure ſuch an end, then they muſt ſay, (which if they do, 'tis no better than blaſphemy) That the Holy Spirit could not, or would not give a good means for that end, for which he intended it. But it is certain, that the Holy Scriptures are ſo far from being (what they untruly ſay) a cauſe of Hereſie, Sedition or Schiſm, that no Book in the world, does, or can condemn thoſe crimes, with that clear evidence and Authority, which the Bible doth. Eſpecially ſeeing the Scripture is the ſole authentick Rule to know, what Doctrines are *de fide*, and what *heretical*; and therefore I have often wonder'd, what Hereſies they mean, when they ſay that reading the Scripture, is the cauſe of Hereſie; ſeeing no Doctrine is, or can be *de fide*, a Doctrine or Article of our Chriſtian Faith, which is not contain'd in Scripture (that being the adequate Rule and meaſure of our Chriſtian Faith) nor can any thing be truly and properly Hereſie, which is not contrary to ſome Divine truth reveal'd

* *Variæ hæreſium & errorum cauſæ naſcerentur, ac infinita propemodum alia incommoda ac mala proveniret*, Azorius *before cited*, p. 830, 831.

‖ *Joh.* 20. 31. 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16. *Jam.* 1. 21. *Act.* 17. 11, 12.

veal'd in Scripture: But * *Azorius* (and others) tell me, that *Articles of Faith and Heresies are not to be measured and defined by their agreement or disagreement with Scripture only, but also by their agreement and disagreement with the Doctrinal definitions of the Church of* Rome. So that not only the Articles of the Apostles Creed, of that of *Nice*, of *Constantinople*, and *Chalcedon*, are *de fide*, and all contrary Doctrines, Heresies: (in which we and they agree) but also all the Articles of their *new Trent* * *Creed*, (first published by Pope *Pius* the *4th.* in the year 1564.) are at *Rome* ‖ *de fide*, and all Doctrines contrary to any Article of that new Creed, they call Heresies, and condemn them. Here I consider,

* *Quæres, quid nomine Fidei catholicæ veniat?* Respondeo, *Quicquid est in Ecclesia propositum tanquam fide credendum, quales sunt Articuli fidei, & quæ sacræ literæ tradiderunt*; aut quæ generalis Ecclesiæ consensus definivit. *Azorius Institt. Moralium. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 8. *cap.* 26. *pag.* 818. *D.*

* This new *Trent*-Creed in most editions of that Council, is placed at the end of that Council; But in the Edition at *Antw.* 1633. 'tis placed (and most properly) *Sess.* 24. *de Reformatione cap.* 12. at the end of the *chap. pag.* 450, 451. ‖ *Hæc est Fides Catholica, extra quam nemo est salus; contraria omnia & hæreses ab Ecclesia damnatas, pariter damno. Ibid. pag.* 452.

1. That all Protestants do believe and profess many Doctrines contradictory to the Articles of their New *Trent*-Creed, as is confess'd.
2. And the Sacred Scriptures are the reason and ground why we do so; which (in express terms, or by evident consequence) condemns many of their Doctrines (as their worshipping of Images, denying the Cup to the Laity, and to Priests, that do not Consecrate, forbidding the Clergy to marry, *&c.*) And yet they mis-cal us Hereticks, and our Doctrines maintain'd against them (tho' consonant to the Sacred Scripture) Heresies, and accuse Scripture as the cause of Heresies, not that it is the cause of Heresies pro-

perly and truly so call'd, which are errors contrary to the infallible Rule of Faith, (for this would make Scripture contradict it self) but because it is the true ground and reason why we believe and profess many Doctrines, which are contrary to the erroneous definitions of their Church; so that we confess the Scripture is the cause of those things, which (tho' real truths) they mis-cal Heresies. But to deprive the People of the benefit, and comfort of the Scriptures, upon so irrational and frivolous a pretence, is evidently injust in them, and not only dangerous, but pernicious to the people. So that, had we no other reason but this (the depriving the people of the use and benefit of the Scriptures) it were abundantly sufficient, to justifie our Separation from *Rome*.

2. Reason. But Secondly, The Church of *Rome* does not only deprive the People of the benefit and comfort of Scriptures (prohibiting the reading or having them in any vulgar Language by them understood,) but, for the same reason they deprive them of the benefit, and Edification, they might, and ought to have had, in the publick service of God; all their Liturgies, and publick Sacred Offices (Missals, Breviaries, *&c.*) being in Latin, a Language not understood by the people (and many times not by the *Priests themselves) who not understanding the Language in which the Publick Service of God was celebrated, could not possibly know to whom, (whether to God, or Saint, or Angels)

*Which evidently appears by this, that now of later times, the words in their Missals and Breviaries are accented, that their Priests might pronounce the words right, which otherwise, it seems, they could not. So they print *Hóminis*, lest the Priest should call it *Homīnis*.

or

or for what, the Prieſt prayed; and ſo could not (which the Apoſtle thinks they ſhould in publick Prayers and Thankſgivings,) *ſay* * *Amen to anything ſaid by him*, who did officiate. For this practice of the Church of *Rome* (in having their Liturgies in a Tongue not underſtood by the People) that it is unjuſt in them, and pernicious to the People, I ſhall only ſay two things:

* 1 Cor. 14. 16.

1. That it is expreſly againſt Scripture, and the directions ‖ the Apoſtle has given againſt it. He ſpends a whole Chapter to this purpoſe, and with ſo much zeal, and ſo many reaſons demonſtrates, that publick Prayers, and Divine Service ought not to be in an unknown Language; that it is a wonder, that any, who pretend to be Chriſtians, ſhould (as they of *Rome* do) dare to contradict an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, and that Holy Spirit by which he ſpoke. I know, that ſome of the greateſt * Writers for *Rome*, and the Vindication of their Sacred Offices in an unknown Tongue, indeavour to Anſwer the Apoſtles reaſons in this Chapter, but with ſuch inſignificant, and miſerable ſhifts, that you will eaſily ſee that they indeavour that which they cannot poſſibly do.

‖ 1 Cor. 14.

* *Vid. Acoſtam Juſt. Morſtium Tom.* 1. *lib.* 8. *c.* 26. *p.* 830. *A B.* Sure I am (to ſay nothing of *Eraſmus, Caſſander, &c.*) *Card.* Contarenus *in Catechiſ. Interrogat. ultima, operum, p.* 545. *and Card.* Cajetan *on this Chap. confeſs*, that to have publick Prayers in a known tongue, *is more for the edification of the People*: and after the year 1215, *Innocent* the 3*d.* is of the ſame opinion, *vid. Concil. Lateran. ſub* Innocentio 3. *Can.* 9.

2. And that it was as manifeſtly againſt the practice of the Church of God (Jewiſh and Chriſtian) in all Ages, is as manifeſt, and by ſober and ingenuous perſons of the *Roman* Communion, confeſs'd. Now do you conſider, how pernicious this muſt needs be to the People to deprive them of that

great comfort, and edification, which they might, and ought to have had by the publick Service of God in a Language by them understood; especially seeing Cardinal *Contarenus* and *Cajetan* (convinced of this truth) confess in the places now cited; that if the Sacred Offices, and publick Prayers were in a known Tongue, it would tend much more to the Edification and benefit of the People.

3. Reason. Thirdly, While we were in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, the one half of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was taken from us; therefore we had good reason to separate from their Communion. The Cup in the Eucharist, was taken from the Laity, and all Priests too, (save him who did * Consecrate) and this is most unjust and illegal: 1. Because it is against the express Institution, and Command of our Blessed Saviour, who says, ‖ *Drink ye All of this*; and S. *Mark* particularly observes, that *they did* * *All drink of it*. So that they might (tho' with no just reason, yet) with more pretence, have taken away the Bread; For 'tis never said, *Eat ye All of this*, nor express'd that they did all eat of it. And the Decree of the Council of ‖ *Constance* (the first Council that took away the Cup from the Laity, in the year 1415.) is most intolerable; for they command (upon pain of Excommunication) that none should Communicate the Laity in both kinds) in express contradiction to our Blessed Saviour's command. * *Non obstante Institutione Christi.* They say indeed, that the whole ‖ Body and blood of our Blessed Saviour

* *Vid. Concil. Const. Sess.* 13. p 65. *edit. per Joh. Petit. Paris.* 1514.

‖ *Matt.* 26. 27.

* *Mark* 14. 23.

‖ *Concil. Const. Sess.* 13. *Junii* 15. 1415.

* *Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, & Discipulis sub utraque specie administraverit, hoc tamen non obstante, &c.* Where the giving it after Supper is only an indifferent circumstance, no part of the *Institution* which consists in these words---*Drink Ye All of This.* ‖ *Non dubitandum integrum Christi corpus & sanguinem, tam sub specie vini, veraciter contineri.* Ibid.

viour, is truly contain'd as well under the ſpecies of Bread, as the ſpecies of Wine. But admit this (which is a great error) that the whole Body and Blood be really and truly in the Bread, ſo that the Laity in their Wafer receive both the Body and Blood; then

1. Why did our Bleſſed Saviour inſtitute it, in both kinds? if the Apoſtles receiv'd his body and blood in the Bread, why did he give the blood a ſecond time in the Cup?
2. If the Laity receive the whole Sacrament (the body and blood of our Bleſſed Saviour.) in the Wafer, why needs the Prieſt who Conſecrates, receive any more?
3. But admit that our Bleſſed Saviour's blood were wholly in the Wafer, and the Body in the Cup (as the Fathers of *Conſtance* ſay,) yet by their own receiv'd Principles, the blood is not * Conſecrated in the Wafer, nor his Body in the Cup: (their form of Conſecrating the bread in the Wafer, being different from the form of Conſecrating the blood in the Cup) and then admit, that the blood were in the Wafer, yet it is not Conſecrated in the Wafer, and therefore is not Sacramental blood, or any part of the Sacrament as it is in the Wafer, and therefore the Lay-men who receive only the Bread or Wafer, do not receive the whole, but only one part of the Sacrament, and ſo (contrary to our Bleſſed Saviour's command) are depriv'd of the Blood, the other part of the Sacrament.

* *Vid. Miſſale Romanum in Canone miſſæ, & Catechiſ. Trident. part. 2. cap. 4. de Euchariſtia Sect. 19.* where the Conſecrating of the Bread, is in theſe words, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum.* But the Conſecration of the Blood is in many more, and other words (*Sect. 21.*) To wit in theſe, *Hic eſt calix Sanguinis mei, novi & æterni Teſtamenti, myſterium fidei, qui pro vobis, & pro multis effunditur in Remiſſionem Peccatorum.*

4. But

4. But however it is most certain and evident, that *they do not drink the blood in the wafer*, and therefore disobey our Blessed Saviour's command, who expressly says, *Drink ye All of this.*

By the Premisses, I think it may and (to impartial Judges) will appear, That the taking away the Cup from the Laity, is a kind of Sacriledg in the Church of *Rome*; as being against the *Institution*, and expres *command* of our Blessed Saviour: Nor is this all, for it is as much contrary to the practice

1. Of the Apostles; and
2. Of the Christian Churches after them.

For the first, *S. Paul* hath two signal things concerning this Subject. For writing to the *Corinthians* about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (and he
* 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. tells them that he had * *received of the Lord*, what he writ to them) he says,

1. That the Host (to use their word) was *only Bread*, and not the *very Body and Flesh* of our Blessed Saviour. For in two Chapters to the *Corinthians* he
‖ 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. and 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28. *calls it Bread* ‖ *five times after Consecration*; and we may be sure, he call'd it what he thought it was; and what both his own, and all their Senses manifestly saw, and judg'd it to be. It is true, the Apostle in the same Chapter says; That the eating of the Bread is
* 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. the Communion of the * *Body* of Christ. Not *Communio propria & substantialis*, as if they had really eaten the very substance of our Saviour's flesh; but *Communio typica & Sacramentalis*; they eat his Body in eating the bread which was a Sacramental sign of his Body. So a little before in the same Chapter, he says, that the *Jews* (in *Moses* his time) eat the same
‖ 1 *Cor.* 10. 2, 3. ‖ *spiritual meat*, and drank the same *spiritual drink*, for they drank of the *spiritual Rock*, *which was Christ.*

Not

Not that they did, or could then, really and properly eat or drink his Fleſh and Blood (for it was above 1400 years before our Bleſſed Saviour had any fleſh or blood) but they eat his fleſh, and drank his blood *in ſignis & typis Sacramentalibus.* They eat our Bleſſed Saviour's Body in the Manna, which was a type only, and our Saviour himſelf the *true* * *Manna*, Sacramentally ſignify'd by it; ſo he ſays, the Rock was Chriſt, that is (the Sign having the Name of the thing ſignified, as is moſt uſual) a type of Him.

* *Joh.* 6. 31, 32.

2. It is evident by the places ‖ cited) that the *Corinthians* (by the Apoſtles directions) receiv'd the Cup as well as the Bread. But beſides our Bleſſed Saviour's Inſtitution of the Sacrament in both kinds, and the Apoſtles directions (which are obligatory and commands) that it ſhould be ſo receiv'd; there is one thing more which aggravates the error and injuſtice of the Church of *Rome* in taking away the Cup from the Laity, which they do in contradiction to all other Chriſtian Churches, which (ever ſince the Apoſtles time to this day) have approv'd and practis'd the receiving the Sacrament in both kinds. Nay in the Church of *Rome* itſelf for above 1200 years after our Saviour, all (both Lay and Clergy) received in both kinds. I ſhall not take any pains to prove this, becauſe it is a truth ſo evident, that many *Roman* Catholicks, and they (both for Learning and Dignity) eminent perſons have confeſs'd it. Cardinal * *Bona*, in a book by him lately publiſh'd, has a ſignal paſſage to our Purpoſe; his own words you have faithfully

‖ *1 Cor.* 10. 16, 17, 21. and *1 Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28. *Vide Tyrannum in dictum ver.* 28.

* *Certum eſt omnes Clericos & Laicos, viros & mulieres, ſub utraque ſpecie Sacra myſteria antiquitus ſumpſiſſe, cum ſolenni eorum celebrationi aderant, & offerebant, & de oblatis participabant: nec hoc negare poteſt, qui vel leviſſima rerum Eccleſiaſticarum notitia imbutus ſit. ſemper enim & ubique ab Eccleſiæ primordiis uſque ad ſeculum 12. ſub ſpecie Panis & Vini communicarunt fideles.* Card. *Bona* rerum Liturgicarum. lib. 2. c. 18. p. 491, 492. Ed. Pariſ. 1672. vid. lib. in Append. p. 555. in Liturgia Romana Antiqua.

cited.

cited in the margin. And for the meaning of the words in the Margin--*Cum offerebant, & de oblatis participabant*, if you consult *Cassander*, he will tell you; *Quod omnes Laici qui aderant ‖ offerebant, & Diaconi * & omnis populus de calice communicabant.*

* *Vid Ordinem Romanum de Officiu Missæ apud* Cassandrum, *operum p.* 106. ‖ *Ibid. pag.* 107. * *Ibid. pag.* 112, 113. 124. 132. *vid.* G. Watsii *adversaria ad* Matth. Parisiensem, *ad Hist. pag.* 9. *lin.* 6.

For farther confirmation of this truth, that anciently in the *Roman* Church, the Laity had the Cup for above 1200 years; I shall refer you

1. To the 27. Canon * of the *Lateran* Council, under *Alexander* the third, in the year 1180.
2. Can. 28. *Concilii* ‖ *Claromontani celebrati, anno* 1095.
3. *Petrum de Marca, de Primatu Lugdunensi, pag.* 441, 442, *&c.*
4. *Cassandrum vid. in Consultatione, de utraque specie Sacramenti, pag.* 182.
5. *Lindanum vid. Panoplia lib.* 4. *pag.* 342.
6. Lastly, *Greg.* * *de Valentia* goes farther than some of his followers will, and plainly confesses, That the custom of Communicating in one kind only ‖ *began* to be general, a little before the Council of *Constance*, (in his Tract *de legitimo usu Eucharistiæ, cap.* 8. *&* 10.) and that Council sate, and made that bold Decree, to take away the Cup, *An.* 1414. And here it is very observable, that altho' it was the express command of our Blessed Saviour, and of the Apostle S. *Paul* from him, that all should receive the Cup, as well as the Bread; and although it was the practice and *custome* of all other Christian Churches in the World to this day, to receive it so, and (as *Greg. de Valentia* confesses) of the *Roman*

* *Apud Pet. Crab. Conciliorum, Tom.* 2. *pag.* 843.
‖ *Apud Binium Conc. Tom.* 7. *part.* 1. *p* 507. *col.* 2.

* Consuetudo communicandi sub Altera tantum specie, in Ecclesia Latina cœpit esse generalis, non multo ante tempora Concilii Constantiensis.
‖ *Et vid. Synodicon Ecclesiæ Parisiensis. Pavii* 1674. *p.* 6. *inter decreta Odonis de Soliaco qui floruit circa An.* 1208. *quo tempore Laici calicem habebant.*

Roman Church, till a little before the Council of *Conſtance*; yet that Council (in * contradiction to all this) ‖ grounds the prohibition of the Cup, upon (which is moſt falſe) a moſt ancient and approv'd *cuſtome* of the Church, to receive only in one kind; which cuſtome (they ſay) has the obligation of a Law, and ought to be obſerv'd. This Decree of the Council (to ſay no worſe) is highly irrational. For can any intelligent perſon think, that a *late cuſtom* of a particular (the Latin) Church, ſhould be ſufficient to warrant Communion in one kind, and taking away the Cup from the Laity; when the *inſtitution*, and expreſs *command* of our Bleſſed Saviour, and his *Apoſtles*, did (as 'tis evident S. *Paul* did) require the People to receive in both kinds; and *the perpetual practice* and *cuſtome* of the *Univerſal Church* of *Chriſt*, (even of *Rome* herſelf) for above 1200 years, was to give the Sacrament in both kinds: However what was moſt erroneouſly decreed at *Conſtance*, is confirm'd at *Trent*, and the Cup taken from the Laity, though both the * Emperour and the King of *France* (by their Biſhops in that Council) earneſtly deſir'd that it might be reſtored. Seeing then, that (the Premiſſes conſider'd) it is, or (ſo Impartial Judges) may be evident; That the Church of *Rome* injuriouſly forbids the Laity and all Prieſts (ſave he who Conſecrates) to drink of the Cup in the Sacrament, and our Bleſſed Saviour expreſly commands

* *Hoc non obſtante, Canonum Authoritas laudabilis, & approbata conſuetudo Eccleſiæ, ſervat & ſervavit, &c.* Seſſ. 13.

‖ *Unde cum hujuſmodi conſuetudo ab Eccleſia & Sanctis Patribus rationabiliter introducta, & diutiſſimè obſervata ſit, habenda eſt pro Lege, &c.* Concilium Conſtan. Ibid. Seſſ. 13.

* *See the Hiſtory of the Council of* Trent, *by Father* Paul *of* Venice, *ſub Pio* 4. ad An. 1561. p. 458. *of the Tranſlation, (if you have not the Original) and* pag. 459.

UMI

mands the contrary, saying,---*Drink ye* * *All of this*, and in obedience to his command *they did All* ‖ *drink* it. I suppose we may justly say to the Pope * and his party, what the Apostles (on the like occasion) said to the high Priest and the Council of the *Jews*: *It is better* ‖ *to obey God than men*, and to separate from the Communion of that Church, which (with great wrong and Iniquity) denyes us the Communion of the Cup, which our Blessed Saviour commands us to drink in Remembrance of him.

* *Matt.* 26. 27.

‖ *Mark* 14. 23.

* *Vid. Concil. Trident. Sess.* 22. *de Reformat. cap.* 11. Where the Council refers it to the Pope, to consider of the restitution of the Cup to the Laity; who has been considering above 120. years, and as yet nothing done, to give satisfaction to the Church.

‖ *Act.* 4. 19.

4. Reason, *a Matrimonio Clericis prohibito.*

4. Another Reason, to justifie our Separation from *Rome*; that it was not Sinful nor Schismatical, may be taken from their denying Matrimony to the Clergy; against the light of Nature, of Scripture, and the Judgment, and Practice of the Church of God, (Jewish and Christian) in all Ages. Concerning this, I shall only set down some few particulars, in short; and leave them to your prudence, to use these, or add such other particulars, as (circumstances consider'd) may seem to you more convenient. And here I consider

1. That here in *England*, not only in the *Saxon*, but also in the *Norman* times, the Secular Clergy were married; concerning which, we have a signal passage in *Matth.* * *Paris.* (out of *Rog. Wendover*) as also in our ‖ other Historians. *Matth. Paris.* tells us,

* *Matth. Par. ad An.* 1074. *p.* 9. *in edit. watsii*, Iste Papa (*Gregorius* 7.) in Synodo Generali Sacerdotes Uxoratos à divina officio removit, & Laicis missas eorum audire interdixit. Novo exemplo, & ut multis visum est. Inconsiderato judicio, contra Sanctorum Patrum sententiam. Ex qua re, tam grave oritur scandalum, ut nullius hæresis tempore Sancta Ecclesia graviori schismate sit discissa.

‖ *Vid.* Tho. Walsingham *Hypodig. Neustriæ ad An.* 1074. *p.* 439.

1. That

1. That Pope *Gregory* the *7th.* in a General Council, prohibited all married Priests to celebrate any Divine Offices, and forbid the Laity to hear any of their Masses, which was in the year 1074.
2. That this was a *New thing*, and an *Innovation* brought into the Church by that Pope.
3. That *many believed* it to be a *rash* and *inconsiderate act* of that Pope against the *Judgment of the Holy Fathers.*
4. And then he tells of the *horrid effects* and *ill consequences* which follow upon it. However (to say nothing of the Ethiopick or Greek Churches, who never did receive the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church concerning the Celibacy of their Priests) by the Premisses, it is certain, that even in the *Roman* Church, for above 1000 years after Christ, Priests were some of them marry'd, and afterwards when they were prohibited to marry, it was judged to be (as the Historian tells us) 1. An *Innovation.* 2. A *Rash* and *Inconsiderate act.* 3. Against the *Judgment* of the *Holy Fathers.* 4. And that it had *mischievous consequences*; scarce *any Heresie* having made a greater *Schism in the Church*, than this *Prohibition of Priests marriages.*

2. But however the Popes prohibition of Priests marriages was censur'd then; yet it prevail'd afterwards in the *Roman* Church, as may appear (to omit others) by the Council of *Trent.* For that Council (tho' the * *French* were earnest for the marriage of the Clergy) condemns all those, who say that the Priests ‖ marriages are lawful, or valid if they do marry. This (they know) all Protestants

* *V. Hist. Conc. Trid. sub Pio 4. versionis Angl. p. 177. ad Ann. 1563.*

‖ *Conc. Trident. Sess. 24. de Sacramento Matrimonii, in Initio can. 9.*

testants say, and (as they have good reason) believe, and so they lye under the Councils Anathema. But tho' they are so fierce against their Priests Marriages; yet their Canon-Law will allow him who has no wife, to keep a * *Concubine*, and it shall be no hindrance to him, but he may receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in contradiction to the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 5.11. But of late, they will not allow (at least they will not publickly own it) the keeping of Concubines, yet they do say, that ‖ *if a Priest keep a Concubine, and commit fornication,* (tho' it be a sin, yet) it is a less sin, than to have a wife of his own; that is (in plain and true English) it is a greater sin with them, to disobey the Pope and his party, who disapprove and prohibit Priests Marriages; than to disobey our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, who approve, and in some cases (as to avoid * *burning*, and preserve Chastity) expresly command it, as shall hereafter evidently appear.

* *Is qui non habet uxorem, & pro uxore Concubinam habet, à communione non repellatur; si una concubina sit contenta,* Can. Is qui 4. Diss. 34.

‖ *Sacerdos si fornicetur, aut domi concubinam foveat, tametsi gravi Sacrilegio se obstringat, gravius tamen peccat, si contrahat matrimonium.* Cost. in Ench. c. 15. propos. 9. p. 459.

* 1 *Cor.* 7. 2, 9.

3. And here it will be worth our time and pains diligently to consider, what the reason and cause is, why the Pope and his party so severely forbid the Marriages of their Clergy. For

1. It cannot be for Religion, and Reformation of their Clergy, to make them and their lives more conformable to the Gospel, and the Laws of the primitive and purer Christianity. For 'tis evident, that the Gospel approves the Marriages of the Clergy, and several of the ‖ Apostles themselves were marryed, and so were the Bishops and Priests in the Primitive and purest times of Christianity; as is both in itself evident, and * confess'd by our Adversaries, even by

‖ 1 *Cor.* 9. 5.

* *Antiquissimis Ecclesiæ temporibus, vivente adhuc Apostolis, & post Apostoles aliquot adhuc annis admissi sunt ad sacros ordines viri conjugati.* Costerus Jesuita in Ench. c. 15. propos. 2. p. 448. ed. Col. 1587.

the

the Jesuites, the most zealous Advocates for the Errors of the *Roman* Church. So that the disapproving and prohibition of Priests Marriages, is so far from being a matter of True Religion, and Reformation of them and their lives, according to the Gospel, and purest times of Christianity; that 'tis directly contrary to it.

2. Nor can the Prohibition of Priests Marriages be for this end and reason, to make their Clergy better men and more pious Christians. For (upon our Adversaries own principles) it deprives them of the good means, which God himself has instituted, for their Justification and Salvation. For, First, The *Trent* Fathers tell us; That all * *true justice* is either begun, or increas'd, or repair'd by the Sacraments. Secondly, They say, that Matrimony is a Sacrament instituted by our Blessed Saviour, and ‖ *confers* grace. And therefore the forbidding the Clergy to marry, deprives them of that means, which (by their own confession) our Blessed Saviour instituted to confer Grace; and therefore the Celibate and single Life of the Priests cannot be a means to make them better men, or more pious Christians; seeing it deprives them of the means which our Blessed Saviour instituted to make them such. If it be said, that Matrimony was not a Sacrament instituted for Priests, as the Sacrament of Orders was not for the Laity. To this I say, First, If Matrimony was (as they say) a Sacrament instituted by our Blessed Saviour to confer Grace, then whoever was legally married, according to the mind of Christ, and the Law of the Gospel, received Grace by it. Secondly, Several of the Apostles and Primitive Bishops and Priests were so legally married, and so had the Sacrament of Matrimony, which

* *Per Sacramenta omnis vera justitia vel incipit, vel cœpta augetur, vel amissa reparatur.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. de Sacramentis in Proœmio, & Can. 6. 7.

‖ *Si quis dixerit Matrimonium non esse verè Sacramentum à Christo institutum, neque gratiam conferre, Anathema sit.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 24. de Matrim. Can. 1.

which (in the judgment of the Church of *Rome*) did really confer Grace to all, *qui non* * *ponebant obicem*, who by their own Impiety did not hinder the gracious effect of that Sacrament. Whence we may evidently conclude; that if the Sacrament of Marriage did (as our Adversaries say it did) confer Grace on all, whose impiety did not hinder the effect of it; then certainly it conferr'd Grace on the Apostles, and the Apostolical Bishops and Priests in their time; it being irrational and uncharitable to think, that the impiety of those excellent and Divinely inspired Persons, should be so great, as to hinder the effect of that Sacrament. Now if the married Apostles did receive Grace signified and sealed to them by that Sacrament, so might their Successors too, to this very day, had not the Church of *Rome* by prohibiting Priests to marry, depriv'd them of that Sacrament, and so of that Grace and Spiritual Benefit they might have received by it. So that although the Pope and his party might pretend the pious ends above mention'd, for their prohibition of Priests marriages, (as they want not fair pretences for foul Actions) yet 'tis evident, they were but vain pretences, seeing the prohibition of those marriages, is so far from being a means to attain those ends, that it utterly overthrows them both.

* *Sacramenta novæ legis gratiam quam significant omnibus, obicem non ponentibus conferunt.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. in Decreto de Sacram. Can. 6.

3. But the true reason why at *Trent* they prohibited the Clergy to marry, was; becaus the Popes greatness and interest in all Countreys where Popery prevail'd, would be lost, if Priests were permitted to marry; as evidently appears, by the reason given in the *Trent* Council, by the greatest Advocates for *Rome*, why the marriage of the Priests was deny'd (tho' the ‖ Emperor and the *French* desir'd it) for Father *Paul* of *Venice*, thus expresses it, * *It is plain* (say

‖ *See the Hist. of the Council of Trent. ad An.* 1563.

* *See the said Hist. ad dictum An.* 1563. *pag.* 680.

(ſay the great Advocates for *Rome*, and the Popes Authority) *that married Prieſts will turn their affections to their Wives and Children, and by conſequence, to their houſe and Countrey, ſo that the ſtrict dependence which the Clergy hath upon the Apoſtolick See, would ceaſe; and to grant marriage to Prieſts, would deſtroy the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, and make the Pope to be Biſhop of Rome only.* So that their prohibition of marriages was to make the Clergy faithful * ſubjects to the Pope, and to depend upon him, and not on their King and Country where they were born and lived. And hence came the Papal exemptions of the Clergy from the Juriſdiction of all temporal Princes; ſo far, that they deny the Clergy to be Subjects to Kings, and therefore cannot be guilty of any Treaſon againſt them. They condemn this Propoſition as erroneous (if not Heretical) ‖ *Sacerdotes Principibus Jure Divino ſubditi.* But this Rebellious doctrine is ſo generally and publickly aſperſed by their Canoniſts, Caſuiſts, and other approved Writers of the Church of *Rome*, that I neither need, nor ſhall ſay any more to prove it.

* The Popiſh Biſhops take an oath of abſolute Allegiance to the Pope. *Vide Pontif. Rom. de Conſec. Epiſc. p.* 57. *edit.* Romæ *Anno* 1611.

‖ So the Spaniſh and Portugal Indices *Librorum prohibit.* command this Propoſition to be blotted out of the Index of *Chryſoſtome.*

By the Premiſſes it may appear, that the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in diſapproving Prieſts marriages (eſpecially, for ſuch unjuſt and unworthy ends) is erroneous, and their practice the occaſion * of great ſcandal. Which will farther appear, becauſe our infinitely good and gracious God has ever

* Their own ſober Authors ſadly complain of the impure lives of their unmarried Clergy; *Huniſ. Oricbovius in oratione de cœlibatu pag.* 108, 110, 189. hath theſe words--*Scorta Romæ quotannis tributa conferunt; earum cenſum cum anno abhinc ſexto ageret Præfectus Lictorum urbis, cenſa ſunt meretricum capita* 55000. and *Honorius Auguſtodunenſis, Dialogo de prædeſtinat. & Libero arbitrio, ait, Verte te ad Clerum, videbis in eis beſtiæ tentorium, Sacerdotium per Immunditiam polluunt. Contemplare Monachorum conciliabula, immunditiæ ſordibus computreſcunt, Aſpice habitacula monialium: hæ à tenera ætate impudicitiam diſcant, &c.* But you may ſee this, and much more in Dr. *Crakanthorp's Logick, de Syllogiſmo probabili, cap.* 12. *Sect.* 18 *p.* 414, 415. *edit. London, Anno* 1641.

approved,

approved, and his Church in all Ages practiſed the contrary. And here conſider,

1. That Marriage was inſtituted by God himſelf before the Fall, while *Adam* was in Innocence; ſo that the Inſtitution of Marriage is divine, whereas the Prohibition of it, is only humane (as is confeſs'd) and for unjuſt and unworthy ends.
2. In the Patriarchal Ages before *Moſes* and the Law, there were Prieſts as well as Lay-people; and the *Primogenitus*, or Firſt-born (as is known and confeſs'd) had *Imperium* and *Sacerdotium*, was both Prince and Prieſt. So that the Prieſts (in that interval of time) were certainly married.
3. Under the Moſaical Law, it is as certain (and confeſs'd) that the Prieſts and Levites were marryed, and the Succeſſion of them continued *per Generationem Naturalem*. For had their Marriages been prohibited, one Tribe had neceſſarily periſhed.
4. In the time of the Goſpel the Marriage of the Clergy was * approved by God, and (as is, and muſt be confeſs'd) was practiſed by the ‖ Apoſtles, and Apoſtolical Clergy. Nor are ſuch Marriages only *approved*, but to avoid Fornication, expreſly * commanded in the Goſpel. Continence is *Dei donum*, a gift which he has not ‖ given to all, (as is evident and confeſs'd) and then Marriage is the ‖ *Means* appointed by God to preſerve Chaſtity, and where that is forbidden (as in the Church of *Rome* it is) abominable pollutions will be the fatal conſequence; ſeeing nothing can be more irrational, than to think, that of ſo many hundred thouſands to whom Marriage is forbid in the Church of *Rome* (men and women in the ſtrength and flouriſh

* 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. 4. 12. *Titus* 1. 5, 6.
‖ 1 *Cor.* 9. 5.
* 1 *Cor.* 7. 2, 9.
‖ 1 *Cor.* 7. 9.

flouriſh of their Age) all ſhould have ability to live Chaſtly, neglecting the means which God himſelf has appointed to preſerve it.

To conclude this point, This Prohibition of the Clergy to Marry (had we no other reaſon) were ſufficient to juſtifie our Separation from the *Roman* Communion; eſpecially, ſeeing ſuch Prohibition of Marriage is declared to be a mark and indelible * *character* of Antichriſt, from whoſe Communion we are ‖ commanded to ſeparate.

* 1 Tim. 4. 13.

‖ Rev. 18. 4.